



THE PROCONSULATE OF JULIUS AGRICOLA

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2008 with funding from
Microsoft Corporation

<http://www.archive.org/details/proconsulateofju00hendrich>

THE PROCONSULATE OF JULIUS AGRICOLA IN RELATION TO HISTORY AND TO ENCOMIUM

GEORGE LINCOLN HENDRICKSON

It has been the defect of much which has been written in the effort to explain the literary form of the *Agricola* of Tacitus, that each student has seized upon some single aspect of the work and, discerning the analogy of this part to some phase of encomiastic, biographical, or historical literature, has sought in this direction to find the key to the composition of the work as a whole. So, for example (to take two or three illustrations), Hübner¹ endeavored to identify the *Agricola* with the Roman *laudatio funebris*, and found naturally not a little that supported his contention, in fact more than was conceded by most of his critics, who seemed unwilling to allow the qualifications with which he guarded his contention. More recently, Professor Gudeman² has sought to demonstrate that the *Agricola* corresponds exactly to the rhetorical rules for formal encomium, especially as set forth in the type of imperial panegyric known as the βασιλικὸς λόγος. The effort at special identification was in both cases erroneous, and depends upon certain elements which the *Agricola* has in common with works of the two literary forms named. Again Andresen,³ led by a certain formal resemblance between the manner of historiography and the form of the chapters extending from the description of Britain (10) to the end of Agricola's proconsulate (39), pronounced this section a preliminary fragment of the *Histories*, and denied to it any biographical character whatever.

It has remained for Professor Leo, in his masterly sketch of ancient biographical literature,⁴ to furnish the proper setting for the *Agricola*, and to trace the history of that encomiastic biography which in Greek and in Roman literature had its own development, related to and yet distinct from such types of formal encomium as the *laudatio funebris* or the βασιλικὸς λόγος. The long history of this literary form, with its multitude of tributary influences, cannot here be reviewed. In criticism of Leo's general conclusions, I should only wish to see emphasized somewhat more distinctly the influence which the Roman national custom of the *laudatio funebris* must have had upon giving to the biographies of friends or relatives recently deceased a marked encomiastic character. The *laudatio funebris* was pure encomium, and differed in no essential respect from the Greek theory and practice of encomium; for it is obvious that the funeral oration, not less than political and forensic eloquence, passed entirely into the sphere of theory prescribed by Greek rhetoric. But in Greek literature encomium

¹ *Hermes*, Vol. I (1866), p. 439.

² Edition of the *Agricola*, Boston, 1900.

³ "Die Entstehung und Tendenz des taciteischen Agri-

cola," *Festschrift des Gymnasiums zum Grauen Kloster* (Berlin, 1874), pp. 293 ff.

⁴ *Die griechisch-römische Biographie*, Leipzig, 1901.

was one of the progenitors of biography, and biography is frankly recognized by Polybius⁵ as legitimately encomiastic, in contrast to the objective truth of history. Thus, whether from the Roman institution of the *laudatio funebris*, or from the analogy of Greek prototypes (or from both sources), the Roman biographies of deceased contemporaries were professedly laudatory.

It is not, however, to criticise the general results of Leo's investigations, but to express a partial dissent from his conclusions concerning the *Agricola*, that the following pages have been written—and written, it may be said frankly, with some inward reluctance against entering the field of so endless a discussion.⁶ But no question is settled until it is settled right, and the very correctness of Leo's assignment of the *Agricola* to its general place in the history of biography is a legitimate incentive to expressing disagreement with a detail of his treatment—a detail, however, of no mean proportions, since it has to do with considerably more than half of the life. It concerns, as my title indicates, that part of the treatise which narrates the deeds of Agricola's proconsulate in Britain, together with the introductory survey of the geography and ethnology of the island and its conquest down to the time of Agricola's advent. These chapters, says Leo (p. 231), "are treated in a manner which removes them from the character of biography. This fact has of course often been observed, and attention has been called to it by many, especially by Andresen. To be sure, the narrative has reference to Agricola, and from chapter 18 on he is the leading figure, but not otherwise than a commander would be in any military history."

Nevertheless, there remain certain very essential differences between the greater part of this narrative and the usual manner of historiography (as employed by Tacitus himself, by Livy or Sallust), which make it incorrect, I believe, to affirm that this portion of the work is, in its essence, historical, or analogous to any historical narrative in which a commander plays a similar leading rôle.

Before turning to the analysis of the campaigns of Agricola, I shall consider briefly two introductory points which have a direct bearing on my main argument, although they lie outside of the portions of the text which I have here chosen for discussion.

Non tamen pigebit vel incondita ac rudi voce memoriam prioris servitutis ac testimonium praesentium bonorum composuisse. Hic interim liber honori Agricolae soceri mei destinatus, professione pietatis aut laudatus erit aut excusatus (chap. 3, *extr.*). It seems to be held very generally that this statement places the *Agricola* in relationship to the *Histories* as a preliminary work of a similar kind.⁷ But if these words

⁵ X, 21 (24), 8 (cited below, p. 25).

⁶ Although Professor Leo's work is the immediate stimulus to the present publication, yet the essential outlines of this study were formulated several years ago, and first presented in academic lectures of the autumn of 1899.

⁷ Andresen's is the most extreme form of this view (*loc. cit.*, p. 301): "Die Historien betrachtet er in der That als

sein erstes Werk, dessen ungebildete Sprache er bei den künftigen Lesern desselben entschuldigen zu müssen glaubt; der Agricola ist nur ein Vorläufer, eine Vorstudie, oder wenn man will, geradezu ein Theil der Historien." The general tendency of interpretation may be seen from a few typical utterances: "Hoc libro ut dignissimo exordio historica auspiciatus est, etc." (HAASE, *Tac. op.*, I, xix).

be so interpreted, it surely must be for reasons other than the grammatical sense which they yield. For without attaching any peculiar meaning to *interim*, does the passage, in fact, say anything more than that in the meantime, before the publication of a historical record of the period through which they have just passed, this work is put forth *honori soceri mei destinatus*? That the present work (*hic liber*) stands in any relation of kind to the promised one is in no way conveyed by the grammatical form of the sentence. Whatever relationship is suggested between the character of the two works lies implicit in the quasi-technical terminology, *memoriam* (history) and *honori* (encomium), and this relationship is rather one of difference than of similarity. In the lack of a sufficiently flexible theory of classification, history is, to be sure, sometimes associated with epideictic oratory (Cic., *Or.*, 37). But Aristotle, it would seem,⁸ saw that history belonged in a separate category, and subsequent theorists draw with utmost sharpness the distinction between history and encomium.⁹ The goal of encomium is the presentation of τὸ καλόν (*honestum*), of history τὸ ἀληθές. The former may euphemize, suppress, amplify, in order to admit no impression but that of the meritorious or praiseworthy; the latter is bound to strict objectivity and impartiality. Accordingly we find in the preface to both of Tacitus's historical works the avowal of unpartisan devotion to truth, which befits the historian.¹⁰ Here, however, he says with similar explicitness that the present work is devoted to the *honor* of his father-in-law, Agricola. Its subject-matter is, therefore, *honesta*, such things as shall redound to the praise of the person commemorated.¹¹ Thus the phrase *honori desti-*

"Tacitus will also seiner Agricola . . . als eine historische Schrift betrachtet wissen" (HOFFMANN, *Z. f. öst. Gym.*, Vol. XXI (1870), p. 251). Of a more general character and without specific reference to this passage, WÖLFFLIN, *Archiv*, Vol. XII, p. 116: "Dass der Agricola und die Germania aber in das Gebiet der Geschichtsschreibung fallen und ihren Platz neben den Historien und Annalen haben, darf als zugestanden vorausgesetzt werden." Even Professor Gudeman speaks of chaps. 18-39 (the *práxeis* of Agricola) as the "strictly historical portion of his biography," and on this theory justifies the presence of the speeches in the *Agricola* (*Int.*, p. xvi).

⁸ NICOL. SOPH. (Sp. III, p. 483, 18): ὁ ἀνὴρ γὰρ ἐκεῖνος . . . τέταρτον παρὰ τὰ τρία τὰ προλεχθέντα τὸ ἱστορικὸν ἐκάλεσε. There is apparently no suggestion of this in the *Rhet.* or *Poet.*, and from what work it is derived does not appear.

⁹ Cf. POLYBIUS, X, 21 (24), 6, cited below, p. 25, and LUCIAN, *De hist. cons.*, 7, who complains of historians as ἀγνοῦντες ὡς οὐ στενῶ τῷ ἰσθμῷ διώριστα καὶ διατετέχιστα ἢ ἱστορία πρὸς τὸ ἐγκώμιον, ἀλλὰ τι μέγα τεῖχος ἐν μέσῳ ἔστιν αὐτῶν. It has seemed worth while to emphasize a well-known distinction in view of Professor Gudeman's statement, p. x: "In fact the line of demarcation between a historical narrative and an encomium was a very slight one." In support of this he cites Doxopater (WALZ, II, p. 413): οὐδὲν δίδοις ψιλῆς ἱστορίας τὸ ἐγκώμιον. But a conclusion based upon the apodosis of a conditional sentence is insecure. The writer is discussing the definition of encomium as a λόγος ἐκθετικός and demands that καὶ αὐξητικός shall be added: ἐπεὶ εἰ μὴ (Walz and presumably the

MSS. read μὲν) τοῦτο προστίθῃ, οὐδὲν δίδοις ψιλῆς ἱστορίας τὸ ἐγκώμιον. The further quotation from Ammianus Marcellinus with which he supports his statement is likewise evidence of the distinction between encomium and history. Ammianus, in the preface to his treatment of Julian, says: "His deeds are so great that the unvarnished record of them is in itself almost encomiastic — *ad laudativam paene materiam pertinebit*" (XVI, 1, 3). Gudeman takes the passage out of its context and causes it to appear as if Ammianus had said that any historical record of events is almost encomium.

¹⁰ *Hist.*, I, 1: *sed incorruptam fidem professis neque amore quisquam et sine odio dicendus est.* *Ann.*, I, 1: *inde consilium mihi pauca de Augusto et extrema tradere, mox Tiberii principatum et cetera, sine ira et studio, quorum causas procul habeo.*

¹¹ For *honestum* (τὸ καλόν) as the goal of the *genus laudativum*, v. the rhetoricians *passim*. QUINTILIAN (III, 4, 16) criticises those *qui laudativam materiam honestorum . . . quaestione contineri putant* as restricting the field too narrowly. For the application to a subject-matter analogous to the *Agricola* cf. PLIN., *Ep.*, VIII, 12, 4: *solicitarer vel ingenio hominis . . . vel honestate matriciae. Scribit exitus industrium virorum, in his quorundam mihi carissimorum. videor ergo fungi pio munere, quorumque exsequias celebrare non licuit, horum quasi funebribus laudationibus, seris quidem sed tanto magis veris, interesse.* The phrase *supremus honor* is used of the *laudatio funebris* in QUINT., *Decl.*, p. 296, 6 (Ritter).

natus places the *Agricola* in a relationship of implied antithesis to the impartial truth of history, and this implicit contrast is, I suspect, expressed further in the mild adversative force which *interim* so frequently combines with its temporal significance. So far, then, from indicating a relationship of similarity to the promised *Histories*, the words imply rather a contrast, the fulfilment of a filial obligation before the author turns to a task absolved from any considerations except those of truth.

The work is thus expressly dedicated to the honor of *Agricola*; its subject-matter is *honestas* as exemplified in him. That the praise of others, however great their merits, is a source of envy and rancor instead of generous recognition, is one of the tritest complaints of the panegyrist of all ages—*urit enim fulgore suo qui praegravat artes infra se positas*. The complaint begins with the earliest prose encomium,¹² and its history can be traced through the whole ancient literature of panegyric. To this weakness of human character Tacitus alludes in the familiar words at the beginning of his preface: *quotiens virtus . . . supergressa est ignorantiam recti et invidiam*.¹³ He would imply that in the purer days of Rome the appreciation of virtue was generous, as the opportunity to display it was easy. But since we must reckon with the jealousy of a baser time, one must ask indulgence for the bestowal of praise. The plea is justified by the filial relation of the biographer to his subject (*professione pietatis*). Tacitus gives, it will be seen, a certain specific motive to the famous *petitio veniae* in the degeneracy of the times. But this is no more than a touch of art to deprive the plea of a certain general and commonplace character by assigning to it the appearance of a reason peculiar to the author or the time. For as the complaint of the *invidia* (φθόνος) which the praise of merit encounters is a commonplace in encomiastic literature, so the *petitio veniae* was a recognized device of rhetoric to anticipate and conciliate the prejudice which envy would inspire. Examples are not, however, numerous or, at all events, have eluded observation. The theoretical formulation of the matter is given very briefly by the rhetorician Apsines in the chapter *περὶ διηγήσεως* (Spengel, I², p. 257, 20): αἱ μὲν οὖν ἐγκωμιαστικαὶ (διηγήσεις) καὶ εὐεργεσιῶν διέξοδον ἔχουσιν· αὐταὶ τοίνυν πομπικώτεραι καὶ πανηγυρικώτεραι· πρόσσεστι δὲ αὐταῖς τὸ ἐπαχθές (*invidia*)· τοῦτο τοίνυν ἐπανορθωτέον ἢ διὰ τῶν προπαραιτήσεων (*deprecationes, petitiones veniae*) ἢ τῷ ἀναγκαίῳ δεικνύναι τὸν λόγον τὰ πολλὰ προσποιούμενον παραλείπειν ἢ ἐξ ἀναιρέσεως τὰ πολλὰ εἰσάγοντα κτλ. Cf. also Aristides, Sp. II, 506, 8: τοῦ δὲ μὴ φορτικῶς ἐπαινεῖν . . . τρόποι εἰσὶν οἷδε. πρῶτον . . . ὡς συναναγκασθεὶς ἐπὶ τοῦτο δοκῇ συνεχθῆναι . . . τρίτος τρόπος ὅταν πρὶν εἰπεῖν τι συγγνώμην ἐφ' οἷς ἂν μέλλῃ λέγειν αἰτῇται κτλ. Another example of such a *προπαραίτησις* we may learn of, or rather infer, from Pliny's account of an address which he had delivered on the dedication of a library at Comum, and was preparing to publish. The subject-matter was encomiastic, and dealt with his own generosity and that of his parents: *anceps hic et lubricus locus est, etiam cum illi necessitas lenocinatur*. The *necessitas* (cf. the passage

¹² Cf. ISOC., *Euaig.*, 6: τούτων δ' αἴτιος ὁ φθόνος κτλ.

¹³ Cf. THEON (π. ἐγκ.), Sp. II, 110, 13: καλαὶ δὲ εἰσι πράξεις . . . τὸν τῶν πολλῶν φθόνον ὑπερβαλλόμεναι.

of Aristides above) lay in the filial duty to commemorate adequately the munificence of his parents, and this obligation of filial affection afforded a ground of indulgence (*lenocinatur*), without, however, wholly eliminating the difficulties which envy imposes upon all praise: *etenim si alienae quoque laudes parum aequis auribus accipi solent, quam difficile est optinere ne molesta videatur oratio de se aut de suis disserentis? nam cum ipsi honestati tum aliquanto magis gloriae eius praedicationique invidemus* (*Ep.*, I, 7, 6).

Tacitus thus conceived of it as a duty imposed by filial regard to write the life of his father-in-law, and it could not occur to him to do this otherwise than in the form of encomiastic biography, which tradition and personal feeling prescribed. But to the difficulties of praise which lie in the nature of human relations was added the special character of the times which ill brooked the prominence of the individual. It was, therefore, a matter of special art to find a form which should accomplish the desired end of laudatory biography without the offense which simply encomium was certain to convey. For the early life of Agricola there was no reason why the ordinary forms of biographical characterization should not suffice (4-9). In the praise of the youthful Agricola there could be no offense. But the events on which his real claims to a lasting place in memory should rest, and in which his greatness of character was most fully revealed, his exploration and complete conquest of Britain, were of a different character. Their importance was such, and they touched so closely, by contrast or comparison, the interests of others still living, that a form of presentation was requisite which should at once accomplish the end sought, and, by the appearance of historical objectivity, disarm criticism and envy. This part of the work, therefore, is cast in the conventional form of history, and even with a certain affectation of observance of the form where, in fact, it is deserted. It is at the same time to be remembered that the conditions of biographical treatment of eminent Romans under the empire were peculiar. The form of classical biography which Plutarch presents has to do, in nearly every case, with men whose careers were varied—political, military, literary, etc. But for an Agricola or a Corbulo the essential matter of biographical record was the proconsular career. In his province the efficient proconsul was a monarch about whose personality, for the time being, the history of a part of the empire revolved. It was inevitable, therefore, that for such portions of a life biographical treatment should pass over to some extent into the related territory of history. But in such cases, though the historical form might be employed, the record of events was likely to be, as in this part of the *Agricola*, essentially in the manner of encomium.

What that manner was is well known to us from the extant specimens of such literature and from the theoretical precepts of the rhetoricians. In its most formal aspects it is a classification of the *πάξεις* under certain *ἀπεραί* as rubrics. It is thus that Cicero praises the *scientia rei militaris*, *virtus*, *auctoritas*, *felicitas* of Pompey by illustrations chosen from his career. The rhetorical formulation of this method may

be illustrated by a single citation from the theorists (Menander, Sp. III, p. 373, 5): διαίρει ἅπανταχοῦ τὰς πράξεις ὧν ἂν μέλλῃς ἐγκωμιάζειν εἰς τὰς ἀρετάς. More analogous to, and yet in details very different from, the *Agricola* is the narrative part of the *Agesilaus*, which is introduced with the words (I, 6): ὅσα γε μὴν ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ διεπράξατο νῦν ἤδη διηγῆσομαι· ἀπὸ γὰρ τῶν ἔργων καὶ τοὺς τρόπους αὐτοῦ κάλλιστα νομίζω καταδήλους ἔσεσθαι. A single further illustration of the method may be added from an encomium of Julian's, in *Constant.*, p. 4 D: ἐφ' ἅπασιν δὲ τούτοις (προσῆκει) ὥσπερ γνωρίσματα τῶν τῆς ψυχῆς ἀρετῶν τὰς πράξεις διελθεῖν. Brief recognition of this conception of biography is made by Tacitus himself in chap. 1: *adeo virtutes isdem temporibus optime aestimantur quibus facillime gignuntur*. That is, the literary record of a life is essentially a presentation of *virtutes*, or character, as illustrated in a man's deeds (*facta moresque posteris tradere*). It is from this point of view that most of the chapters under consideration are written. How widely they differ from Tacitus's historical manner will be illustrated below. Concerning the first chapter of the geographical description of Britain (10), and the motives for the uprising in the administration of Suetonius Paulinus (15), a word later; but now let us turn to the campaigns of Agricola in illustration of what has been said above.

In the first summer, although it was already half gone, Agricola made two important expeditions, the one against the Ordovices, and the other against the island of Mona. Both are narrated rather as revealing the energy and discernment of Agricola than as historical events of significance in themselves. The army looked upon its campaigns for the season as over, and the enemy were on the watch to follow up an advantage recently gained. Meantime they awaited quietly an opportunity to test the temper of the new legate. The troops were dispersed to their stations, the conditions were adverse to an expedition for that season (*tarda et contraria bellum incohatur*), while the advisers of Agricola urged against offensive operations. The whole situation is studiously presented to show the allurements to inactivity which confronted Agricola. It affords thus a background against which to set in effective contrast the energy which he at once displayed. The expedition against the Ordovices was immediately followed up by the invasion of Mona, the motive assigned for which reveals the characterizing significance of the narrative (*non ignarus instandum famae*). The difference between this account of the invasion of Mona and the one described in *Ann.*, XIV, 29 (under Suetonius Paulinus) is especially significant of the distinction between the historical and the encomiastic method of treatment. In the *Agricola* practically the whole of the highly rhetorical narrative is directed to showing the ingenuity and perseverance of the leader in finding means of getting his troops across in the absence of ships, and to describing the effect of wonder and dismay which the display of such resourcefulness produced upon the islanders: *ita repente inmisit, ut obstupefacti hostes, qui classem, qui navis, qui mare expectabant, nihil arduum aut invictum crediderint sic ad bellum venientibus*. The

whole passage is a striking example of a highly elaborated *αὔξησις* (almost to the point of frigidity), directed to the praise of the *ratio et constantia ducis* (vs. 20). Contrast with this the simple statement of the same method of invasion in *Ann.*, XIV, 29: *equites vada secuti aut altiores inter undas adnantes equis tramisere*. There follows then, in the *Annals*, a vivid picture of the natives of the island gathered upon the shore, the fanatical behavior of the Druids, the alarm with which the scene inspired the Romans, the rout of the inhabitants, the stationing of a garrison, the destruction of the sacred groves, and an allusion to the custom of human sacrifice. In the one case we have a narrative of facts and events of a universal, historical significance; in the other, the rhetorical amplification of a single point to illustrate a quality of an individual character.¹⁴ The remainder of the chapter is expressly devoted to drawing inferences for the characterization of Agricola from the deeds of this first season: renown and recognition which followed (*clarus ac magnus haberi*), contrast of his vigor with the ostentation and inactivity of others in the beginning of their administration (*quippe cui ingredientem provinciam, quod tempus alii per ostentationem, etc.*), modesty of bearing in the face of success (*dissimulatione famae famam auxit*).

Apart from the emphasis thus laid upon characterization as distinguished from narrative, the chapter reveals a conspicuous feature of encomiastic style in the constant employment of comparison (*σύγκρισις*), express or implied.¹⁵ I have pointed out above how the whole situation on Agricola's arrival is presented with careful reference to affording a background of obstacles against which to display the efficiency of Agricola in overcoming them. Of a similar character are such explicit contrasts as (vs. 10): *et plerisque custodiri suspecta potius videbatur*; or (vs. 27): *quod tempus alii . . . transigunt*. To this syncritical figure (*σχῆμα συγκριτικόν*) belongs also the rhetorical *αὔξησις* cited above, expressing the surprise of the inhabitants of Mona, who had looked for an invasion by a fleet and, in dismay at the unwonted attack, thought nothing invincible *sic ad bellum venientibus*.

In the passage of the rhetorician Apsines quoted above (p. 6), one of the resources of encomiastic narrative is designated as *ἀναίρεσις*, that is, so to speak, the painting of a negative background against which to set in sharper outline a positive picture. It is obviously a form of the *σχῆμα συγκριτικόν*. It was recognized as a means of lending dignity and impressiveness to style,¹⁶ and in practice it is constantly

¹⁴ Cf. LUCIAN, *Quomodo hist. cons.*, 7 (speaking of the faults of historians): ἀμελήσαντες οἱ πόλλοι αὐτῶν τοῦ ἱστορεῖν τὰ γεγενημένα τοῖς ἐπαίνους τῶν ἀρχόντων καὶ στρατηγῶν ἐνδιατρίβουσιν.

¹⁵ On the encomiastic significance of *σύγκρισις* in general, see the writers of *προγυμνάσματα*, THEON, Sp. II, 112; APHTHONIUS, *ibid.*, 42; HERMOGENES, *ibid.*, 14, and *passim*. Cf. HERMOG., 13, 3: μεγίστη δὲ ἐν τοῖς ἐγκωμίοις ἀφορμὴ ἡ ἀπὸ τῶν συγκρίσεων. The *σύγκρισις* was sometimes formal and elaborate, sometimes merely incidental. The most formal *σύγκρισις* in the *Agricola* is in chap. 41 (cited below, p. 31); the

other examples are for the most part implied comparisons (introduced with such phrases as *non alius, non ut plerique*, or with the figure of *ἀναίρεσις*) merely touched in passing. The theory of them would seem to be alluded to by NIC. SOPH., Sp. III, 481, 17: ἵνα μὴ πάντῃ ἐκλύηται (ὁ λόγος) μόνην μνήμην ποιουμένων ἡμῶν . . . πειρασόμεθα εἰς ἀρετὰς ἀναφέρειν τὰς πράξεις καὶ ἐπάγειν κατὰ μέρος τὰς συγκρίσεις.

¹⁶ HERMOGENES, π. ιδέων (Sp. II, 307, 3): σχήματα δὲ λαμπρὰ ὄσα καὶ εὐεῖδη, οἷον αἱ ἀναίρεσεις κτλ. Cf. also Sp. III, 125, 13, and 130, 8.

found in professedly encomiastic passages. It is especially frequent in characterizing descriptions, as, for instance, in chap. 5: *nec Agricola licenter, more iuvenum qui militiam in lasciviam vertunt, neque sequiter*, etc. . . . *sed noscere provinciam*, etc.; or, again, chap. 8: *nec Agricola umquam in suam famam gestis exsultavit: ad auctorem ac ducem ut minister fortunam referebat*. See also the whole of chap. 9. In all these cases it is constantly combined with (as in the first example from chap. 5, above), or is the expression of, a *σύγκρισις*. The form *nec* or *non* (frequently repeated in anaphora), followed by *sed*, is the most common. Or, as above, in the example from chap. 8, the positive antithesis may be introduced in adversative asyndeton. The phenomenon is one of considerable interest as an index of stylistic tone, and deserves more detailed investigation along with the whole question of rhetorical *σύγκρισις*. It is this figure of *ἀναίρεσις* in which the concluding words of the chapter are cast: *nec Agricola prosperitate rerum in vanitatem usus, expeditionem aut victoriam vocabat victos continuisse; ne laureatis quidem gesta prosecutus est, sed ipsa dissimulatione famae famam auxit, aestimantibus quanta futuri spe tam magna tacuisset*.

Chap. 19 contains a description of the civil administration of Agricola. It does not record particular measures which he introduced to perfect the internal organization of the province, but characterizes his discernment (*animorum provinciae prudens*) in the recognition of the source of evil, and his wisdom and justice in a reform. The only matter of a general historical value which the chapter contains is the explanation of the abuses which had marked the exaction of tribute before Agricola, appended as a contrast to the characterization of his reform in this respect.

As in the preceding chapter, so here, expressed and implied *σύγκρισις* plays a prominent rôle: *domum suam coercuit, quod plerisque haud minus arduum est quam provinciam regere* (vs. 4); *circumcisis quae in quaestum reperta ipso tributo gravius tolerabantur* (vs. 14)—an implied *σύγκρισις* which is then elaborated in the description of former abuses. Note especially the end of this section, which the editors paragraph absurdly with chap. 20: *haec primo statim anno comprimendo egregiam famam paci circumdedit, quae vel incuria vel intolerentia priorum haud minus quam bellum timebatur*. The words summarize in the form of a contrast the encomiastic significance of the preceding characterization. The figure of *ἀναίρεσις* is a marked feature of the style of this section also.

The narrative of the second summer is perhaps the best illustration to be found of the statement made above, that the conventional form of an annalistic record is preserved in these chapters, where on examination the matter is found to be purely characterizing and encomiastic. This brief section, set off in the historical manner between the words *sed ubi aestas advenit* (20, 3) and *sequens hiems* (21, 1), contains neither topography nor names. It is a chapter of characterization pure and simple, and the effort of commentators to locate the geography is futile, if not absurd.¹⁷ The

¹⁷ Cf. WALCH, p. 282, GUDEMAN, *ad loc.*, and FURNEAUX, *Int.*, p. 40. Furneaux adds in a note: "The friths

and forests (*aestuaria ac silvas*) are again alluded to in Agricola's speech, chap. 33, 19. The *silvae* also mentioned in

words themselves show that there is no thought of describing historically recorded operations, but merely of displaying Agricola in the capacity of leader: *sed ubi aestas advenit, contracto exercitu multus in agmine, laudare modestiam, disiectos coercere; loca castris ipse capere, aestuaria ac silvas ipse praetemptare; et nihil interim apud hostis quietum pati, quo minus subitis excursibus popularetur; atque ubi satis terruerat, parcendo rursus invitamenta pacis ostentare*. The form is the so-called historical infinitive which we have seen in the preceding chapter and which plays so large a rôle elsewhere in abstract characterization.¹⁸ The conclusion of the chapter returns to the convention of an annalistic narrative and gives as the result of the campaign a concrete statement: *ut nulla ante Britanniae nova pars <pariter> illaccessita transierit*. But, as we have seen, the part of Britain in question is assigned neither geographical location nor name. It is merely a stage on which to display Agricola in the rôle of an efficient leader.

In similar alternation, as at the end of the first year's campaign, the next chapter is devoted to works of peace. The annalistic form is again preserved, and the chronology of this activity is placed in the second winter of Agricola's administration. But the briefest glance at the contents of the chapter will show how artificial the annalistic formula is. For here are stated results which the whole seven years of Agricola's office would scarcely have sufficed to accomplish; in short, nothing less than the transition of a people from relative barbarism to the refinements of civilization. There can be no doubt that Tacitus means, in fact, to indicate the results of Agricola's influence throughout his whole term of office. But the form chosen has the appearance of referring the efforts of Agricola to a single winter. The description is undoubtedly meant to furnish evidence of the wholesome plans (*saluberrima consilia*) of Agricola for his people, and the satirical remark at the end, *idque apud imperitos humanitas vocabatur, cum pars servitutis esset*, is in reality marginal, so to speak—a gloss of Tacitus the satirist upon the text of Tacitus the encomiast.

The campaign of the third summer gives us, at length, the suggestion of a geographical location; but it is worth while to note how little significance is attached to the historical narrative, and how it is wholly devoted to illustrating the efficiency of Agricola: *tertius expeditionum annus novas gentis aperuit, vastatis usque ad Tanaum . . . nationibus*. The encomiastic element contained in the statement of new discoveries (*sumendae res . . . novitate primae*, Cic., *De Or.*, II, 347) constitutes the main sentence, to which is appended a statement of the operations and their location. The sentence following similarly looks to the praise of Agricola, in that even under adverse conditions his army was not attacked: *qua formidine territi hostes quamquam conflictatum saevis tempestatibus exercitum lucescere non ausi*. The narra-

both places appear to suit those parts, but are probably less distinctive." This reference to Agricola's speech should have sufficed to show that the writer is dealing with a most general description of the difficulties which confront the march of an army. (Cf. 33, 14; 31, 6; 26, 13.)

¹⁸ With the whole passage cf. Statius's characterization of Bolanus (*Silv.*, V, 2, 41): *Bolanus iter praenossetimentum, || Bolanus tutis iuga quaerere comoda castris, || metari Bolanus agros, aperire malignas || torrentum nemonumque moras* (cf. *aestuaria ac silvas praetemptare*), etc. Cf. also the Ps. Tibull. panegyric of Messalla, vss. 82-8.

tive continues: *ponendisque insuper castellis spatium fuit*—a statement which is made the starting-point for a characterization of Agricola's strategic skill in selecting suitable places for fortification (and, with discerning regard for the persuasiveness of his description, it is put in the mouth of military experts who accompanied Agricola): *adnotabant periti non alium ducem opportunitates locorum sapientius legisse*. The encomiastic σύγκρισις contained in these words (*non alium ducem*) is continued in the following, where the despair of the enemy in the face of constant attacks is explained: *quia soliti plerumque damna aestatis hibernis eventibus pensare tum aestate atque hieme iuxta pellebantur*. The remainder of the chapter is wholly characterizing: *nec Agricola umquam per alios gesta avidus interceptit*, etc. At the end we have the only example which the work affords of allusion to a quality of Agricola's character which was open to criticism and had, apparently, in fact been criticised by his subordinates and soldiers: *apud quosdam acerbior in conviciis narrabatur*, etc. But it is a mistake to believe, as has often been said, that this passage furnishes evidence for the impartiality of Tacitus's characterization. On the contrary, it is evidence of the encomiastic tone of the whole. That is, a criticism which was made upon Agricola by others is accepted, but not allowed to stand without interpretation: he was, to be sure, harsh, but *adversus malos*; to the good he was ever kindly (*comis bonis*). The rhetorical theory of such ἀντιθέσεις (that is, things which stand in the way of praise) and of their appropriate λύσεις is alluded to by the technicians, for example, Nicolaus Sophista, Sp. III, p. 481, 28: ζητητέον δέ, εἰ ἀντίθεσιν ἐπιδέχεται τὸ ἐγκώμιον. . . . εἰ δὲ ἐξ ἰδιαζούσης ὕλης ἐμπέσοι, ὃ ἀποκρύφαι οὐ δυνάμεθα διὰ τὸ τὸν ἀκροατὴν αὐτὸ ζητεῖν, τῇ τε μεθόδῳ αὐτὸ καθαιρήσομεν καὶ τὰς λύσεις ἐπάξομεν ἰσχυροτέρας, ἵνα πανταχόθεν τὸ τῆς ἀντιθέσεως βλάβος λύηται (cf. also Menander, *ibid.*, p. 370, 30). The final words of the chapter afford an implied σύγκρισις, which, as editors have seen, probably contrasts Agricola with Domitian: *Ceterum ex iracundia nihil supererat secretum, ut silentium eius non timeres: honestius putabat offendere quam odisse*.

Chap. 23 tells briefly of the regular occupation (*obtinendis*) of the territory which had been explored in the preceding summer and winter, by which the conquest of Britain proper was rendered complete (*summotis velut in aliam insulam hostibus*). The narrative takes much for granted, since we have learned of no specific expeditions which would adequately explain the subjugation of all parts of Britain. But results, with their significance for the praise of Agricola, rather than the historical development of events, are the goal of Tacitus's writing, and this brief section emphasizes the complete conquest of Britain proper in phraseology which shows that this success was but a manifestation of that valor which would not stop until the extreme bounds of the island had been explored. To be sure, Agricola is not named, but it is obvious that whatever is here attributed to the *virtus exercituum* is meant to stand for the *virtus Agricolae*.

It is interesting to observe the art with which, by a series of cumulative expressions, the encomiastic significance of the final penetration of Caledonia is enforced.

Here it is merely suggested negatively as something without which a substantial success would have been achieved (*ac si virtus exercituum et Romani nominis gloria pateretur inventus in ipsa Britannia terminus*). In chap. 27 it is the ambition which fires the army with enthusiasm for further advance (*penetrandam Caledoniam inveniendumque tandem Britanniae terminum*). In chap. 33 pride in the accomplished fact is the basis of Agricola's appeal to the valor of his soldiers before the great battle (*finem Britanniae non fama nec rumore sed castris et armis tenemus*).

Chap. 24 is extremely vague in respect to geographical detail (*nave prima transgressus*), and here again, as elsewhere, the emphasis rests upon the encomiastic implications contained in the main sentence: *ignotas ad id tempus gentis crebris simul ac prosperis proeliis domuit*. The remainder of the chapter, devoted to the description of Ireland and plans for its invasion, serves to illustrate the discerning statesmanship of Agricola in recognizing the strategic position of Ireland with reference to Spain as well as to Britain. In the artistic arrangement of the work it affords a digression from the monotony of successful campaigns, and in this respect is comparable to chaps. 19 and 21, devoted respectively to the civil administration of Britain and to Agricola's influence upon the private life and civilization of his province.

The account of the sixth campaign (25) opens with a brief statement of the scene of operations and of the reasons which led to the employment of a fleet (*portus classe exploravit*). These words are then made the starting-point for an elaborate and highly rhetorical *αὔξησις*, of which the encomiastic *locus ex novitate* (*ab Agricola primum adsumpta*) affords the starting-point. It continues with a vivid and picturesque description of the effect which the combination of a land and sea force produced, of the rivalry and enthusiasm of soldiers and sailors, of the despair and dismay of the enemy. The whole treatment is declamatory and epideictic. Take, for example, the phrase *hinc terra et hostis, hinc victus Oceanus militari iactantia compararentur*. The high rhetorical color is obvious in itself, but a comparison with the declamatory epigrams in praise of Claudius and his expedition to Britain (*P. L. M.*, IV, 29-36) will reveal more clearly the essential affinities of such language. A single illustration may suffice (*ibid.*, 35): *oceanus iam terga dedit, nec pervius ulli || Caesareos fasces imperiumque tulit: || illa procul nostro semota exclusaque caelo, || alluitur nostra victa Britannis aqua*. The section is characteristic. Of the movements of army or fleet we learn nothing, nor is any hint given of the geography of the operations beyond the Bodotria. But, as we have seen, such information lay outside of the author's plan and belonged in the realm of history. He is here only concerned to emphasize the fact that Agricola was the first to employ a fleet and to indicate the effect of dismay which it produced upon the inhabitants. In the description which follows of the gathering of the Caledonians and their initiative in attacking Roman strongholds, especially noteworthy for our purpose is the statement: *regrediendum citra Bodotriam et excedendum potius quam pellerentur ignavi specie prudentium admonebant*. That members of Agricola's staff may have given such

advice, there is no reason to question. But their presence here is probably only a foil against which to set the bravery and generalship of Agricola in clearer light. It is another manifestation of the *σχῆμα συγκριτικόν* which has confronted us so often.

In the following it is to be noted that Agricola knows how to keep in touch with the enemy's plans (*cum interim cognoscit hostis pluribus agminibus irrupturos*) and to foil the snare that they set for him (*cum Agricola iter hostium ab exploratoribus edoctus adsultare tergis pugnantium iubet*, 26, 4). Such skill and knowledge was a constant source of military encomium, so that it has even found formulation in the precepts of the rhetoricians for encomium.¹⁹ At the same time it is not to be denied that the historical tone is preserved in this chapter almost perfectly, and the personality of Agricola here, at all events, is no more obtrusive than would be that of a commander in almost any historical narrative.

This statement applies also to the opening of the following chapter, where, as in 23, by assigning a thought to the army, Tacitus makes it possible to utter with rhetorical exaggeration what is one of his chief claims for the merit of Agricola: *exercitus nihil virtuti sui invium et penetrandam Caledoniam inveniendumque tandem Britanniae terminum continuo procliorum cursu fremebant*. The encomiastic significance of these words appears most clearly when they are put in comparison with the impatient statement of Pliny in *N. H.*, IV, 16 (102): *XXX prope iam annis notitiam eius Romanis armis non ultra vicinitatem silvae Caledoniae propagantibus. Inveniendum tandem Britanniae terminum* is the answer to this complaint. (Cf. also the discussion of this passage above in connection with 23, 1, and 33, 12.) The words which follow are the obverse of the syncrisis made above between the determination and skill of Agricola and the cowardice of his advisers: *atque illi modo cauti ac sapientes prompti post eventum ac magniloqui erant*. They are followed by a significant comment which reveals that Tacitus would claim for the merit of Agricola the successes which a victorious army was prone to attribute to its own prowess: *iniquissima haec bellorum condicio est: prospera omnes sibi vindicant, adversa uni imputantur*.

Concerning chap. 28 (the revolt of the Usipian cohort) every defender of the biographical unity of the *Agricola* has felt it necessary to discover an explanation which shall bring it into relation either to the character of Agricola or to the artistic structure of the work as a whole. But obviously it is futile to seek in it for any element of characterization, and it is equally absurd to find in an annalistic narrative of this sort the high emotional tension which calls for a moment of suspense before the final dénouement. But, though it cannot be said in any way to contribute to our

¹⁹ Cf. MENANDER, Sp. III, 373, 20: ἐκφράσεις δὲ καὶ λόχους καὶ ἐνέδρας καὶ τοῦ βασιλέως κατὰ τῶν πολεμίων καὶ τῶν ἐναντίων κατὰ τοῦ βασιλέως· εἴτα ἑρεῖς ὅτι σὺ μὲν τοὺς ἐκείνων λόχους καὶ τὰς ἐνέδρας διὰ φρόνησιν ἐγίνωσκας, ἐκείνοι δὲ τῶν ὑπὸ σοῦ πραττομένων οὐδὲν συνέσαν. The naïve injunction of the rhetorician is almost equaled by the bald simplicity of the practice of writers of the highest rank. Cf. TACITUS, *Ann.*,

I, 51, 8: *saltusque, per quos exercitui regressus, insedere. quod gnarum duci*, etc.; *ibid.*, II, 20 (after describing the Germans' plan of ambush): *nihil ex his Caesari incognitum*, etc.; *ibid.*, XIII, 40, 3: *repente agmen Romanum circumfundit (Tiridates), non ignaro duce nostro*, etc. STATIUS, *Silv.*, V, 2 (*laudes Bolani*), 40.

knowledge of Agricola, yet for his contemporaries the connection of this famous adventure with his administration must have possessed no little biographical interest. The affair had made a sensation in its day, and the survivors who had reached Roman territory through the devious paths of servitude and sale, reporting their adventure, had attained a notoriety which we can only understand when we realize how vague and remote the unexplored Northern Ocean was felt to be (*ac fuere quos . . . indicium tanti casus inlustravit*). These deserters had accomplished what neither Roman military expeditions nor geographical explorers had as yet succeeded in, the circumnavigation of Britain, and, according to Dio Cassius, it was only in consequence of this that Agricola sent out his own expedition of exploration (66, 20): *καὶ τούτου καὶ ἄλλους ὁ Ἀγρικὸς περᾶσοντας τὸν περίπλου πύμψας ἔμαθε καὶ παρ' ἐκείνων ὅτι νῆσός ἐστιν*. Of this there is no suggestion in Tacitus, but a reason for suppressing the fact might lie in the desire to ascribe the idea of circumnavigation to Agricola's own initiative. Still, the account of Dio Cassius differs in some essential points from Tacitus, so that it must have been derived from a different source. The fact of the existence of a different account of the matter is in itself significant of the celebrity of the episode, and still more the circumstance that it is essentially the only event of Agricola's proconsulship which Dio records. It may be observed in conclusion that Calgacus in his speech before the battle (32, 19) instances this desertion as evidence of the unstable organization of the Roman army. The episode is thus made by Tacitus himself to contribute to the series of obstacles which the generalship of Agricola has to overcome.

The following chapter begins with the record of a domestic blow, the loss of a son—obviously an item of biographical rather than historical significance, and it affords occasion for laudatory characterization of Agricola's conduct under this grief. It assumes again the form of a *σύγκρισις* (*neque ut plerique fortium virorum*, etc.). This brings us, then, to the confronting of the two forces at Mons Graupius, and the speeches of the opposing leaders, Calgacus and Agricola.

The introduction of these harangues by the opposing leaders on the eve of conflict is purely in the manner of historiography, for such speeches as are found elsewhere in ancient biography are of a more personal and characterizing kind. They continue thus the historical form which has been observed in the annalistic record of Agricola's deeds. The general's speech in ancient historiography has a manifold significance. In part it is employed to lend color to the dramatic picture of the whole scene and circumstances of the battle; in part to summarize the historical situation and thus afford a setting for the event of victory or defeat; again it is a means of characterizing the speaker, and of enabling the historian to interpret by the general's own words the character which preceding or following events reveal. Of these considerations the last may here be dismissed, since there could be little point in the indirect characterization of Agricola which the speech would afford, when he has already been characterized directly in much detail. As for Calgacus, there is no reason why he should

be characterized at all. He has not been named in the narrative before, and here he simply steps forth from the throng for the sake of affording a personality to whom words may be assigned, representing the situation from the side of the Britons. But apart from the rhetorical opportunity which is afforded, it is obvious that the speeches summarize the whole course of Agricola's conquests, and prepare the reader for the successful outcome of the battle which was the crowning achievement of Agricola's administration.

The burden of the first part of Calgacus's speech (30) is, that on the Britons there gathered rests the last hope of freedom from the Roman yoke (*hodiernum diem . . . initium libertatis toti Britanniae fore*). They are still free, but beyond them there is no resource—*nullae ultra terrae ac ne mare quidem securum imminente nobis classe Romana*. In earlier contests against the Romans hope of succor had been derived from the fact that they remained still uncorrupted by the touch or sight of servitude (*priores pugnae*, etc.—a form of *σύγκρισις* with encomiastic suggestion, contrasting the conditions of this struggle with all others which Roman commanders had engaged in against the Britons); they were the last of lands and of liberty (*nos terrarum ac libertatis extremos*), and their remoteness had defended them to that day: *sed nunc terminus Britanniae patet, nulla iam ultra gens*. Not satisfied with the conquest of all lands, the Romans now penetrate the mystery of the sea (*iam et mare scrutantur*—rhetorical *αὔξησις*, from the side of the Britons, of Agricola's employment of a fleet). The Romans (32) had been strong only by the dissensions of the enemy who were now united. The Roman army is made up of diverse elements which adversity will scatter. All inducements to victory are on the side of the Britons. The Romans are not fighting for homes nor for native land. They are few in number, unacquainted with their surroundings, and terrified by them. The Britons, Gauls, and Germans, who make up the Roman army, will recognize the identity of their interests with ours, and desert them as did recently the Usipian cohort.

In this speech, apart from the reproaches which are directed against the nature of Roman domination (especially chap. 31), there are two main thoughts developed with all the resources of rhetorical art: (1) that Agricola had pursued resistance to Roman rule to its last stronghold, and (2) that in this conquest the Romans were at a great disadvantage to their adversaries from almost every point of view. Both are, from a negative point of view, sources of encomium to Agricola in the successful outcome of battle.

The speech of Agricola (33) begins with a rhetorical recapitulation of the seven years of campaigns, and it reveals at once in this the main object of these speeches, namely, to present, in the strong rhetorical light which usage rendered appropriate for such military harangues, the claims which the author advances for the praise of Agricola: For seven years he had campaigned successfully with the cordial support of his army (*neque me militum neque vos ducis paenituit*) against almost insurmountable difficulties (*paene adversus ipsam rerum naturam*). As a result they had

advanced beyond the limits set by their predecessors (*egressi ego veterum legatorum, vos priorum exercituum terminos*), and now actually occupied the very limits of Britain, which before were only known by vague rumor or report (*finem Britanniae non fama nec rumore sed castris et armis tenemus*). The passage concludes with the exultant ἐπιφώνημα—*inventa Britannia et subacta*.²⁰ With these words the speech opens, and here for the first and only time is it possible for Tacitus to state directly in strong encomiastic αὔξησης the two claims for distinction derived from the deeds of Agricola, his explorations (*inventa*) and his conquests (*subacta*). His speech continues with conventional exhortation and praise to his soldiers, and allusion is made to the difficulties of their situation (*neque enim nobis aut locorum eadem notitia aut comaeatuum eadem abundantia*). At the end of the chapter he alludes in romantic phraseology to the glory of adventure and, if need be, of death at the very boundaries of the world (*nec inglorium fuerit in ipso terrarum ac naturae fine cecidisse*).²¹ The succeeding section is taken up with conventional depreciation of the enemy, but the brief hortatory peroration returns to the encomiastic τόπος with which the speech opened—*transigite cum expeditionibus, imponite quinquaginta annis magnum diem*, etc. These final words contain the gist of the whole situation. They enable Tacitus to say what in his own person he could not claim without invidious comparison—that Agricola had set the crown on the work begun by Claudius; he had completed the exploration and conquest of the island. By putting the words in the mouth of Agricola, in the form of an exhortation to his army on the eve of battle, they are deprived of all arrogance or invidious suggestion of comparison with the merits of others. The device is analogous to a well-recognized rule of ancient rhetoric which Aristotle formulates thus (*Rhet.*, III, 17, p. 1418b, 24): εἰς δὲ τὸ ἥθος, ἐπειδὴ ἔνια περὶ αὐτοῦ λέγειν ἢ ἐπίφθονον ἢ μακρολογίαν ἢ ἀντιλογίαν ἔχει, . . . ἕτερον χρὴ λέγοντα ποιεῖν. We see here again a conspicuous illustration of what we have noted above in the annalistic record of Agricola's campaign, namely, the skilful use of a form peculiar to historiography for the ends of encomium. Encomium, dealing with deeds of acknowledged greatness, does not hesitate to dwell with epideictic amplification of language upon the merits which are claimed for the subject of praise. But neither were the deeds of Agricola so well known, nor was his place in the history of Roman conquest so generally acknowledged, as to render such treatment possible;²² nor, again, had his position been one of such eminence that his merits could be exalted above those of other governors of Britain without alienating the sympathy of men still living. Tacitus, therefore, by choosing the form of a historical narrative, and by placing in the mouths of the opposing generals the titles to praise which he would claim for Agricola, attained the

²⁰ QUINT., VIII, 5, 11: *est enim epiphonema rei narratae vel probatae summa acclamatio*.

²¹ Cf. *P. L. M.*, IV, 29 (referring to the expedition of Claudius).

²² "That the essential features [of the βασιλικὸς λόγος] are common to biographical writing in general might have been taken for granted, even if Menander (III, 369, 25) had

not expressly confirmed it: οὐ γὰρ ἴδιον τοῦτο μόνον τοῦ βασιλέως τὸ ἐγκώμιον, ἀλλὰ κοινὸν πρὸς πάντας τοὺς οἰκοῦντας τὴν πόλιν" (GUDEMAN, *Int.*, p. x, n. 1). The citation apart from the context would seem convincing if we chose to ignore τοῦτο. But reference to the text shows that τοῦτο τὸ ἐγκώμιον refers to the topic πατρίς as a source of praise. It is this which is "common to all the residents of the city."

end at which he aimed, and avoided at the same time the odium which attaches to direct praise.

That this portion of the *Agricola* which is presented in the form of historiography looks consistently to the praise of Agricola will probably be conceded. It remains to consider Leo's utterance (cited above, p. 4) that "from chap. 18 on Agricola is the leading personality, but not otherwise than the commander would be in any history of military campaigns." If this is true, then, of course, it must be conceded that a large part of the *Agricola* is historical rather than biographical or encomiastic in treatment. I feel convinced, however, that the foregoing analysis has supplied sufficient evidence to refute such a statement. But it will perhaps not be carrying our investigation too far afield, if we undertake to test the truth of this statement by comparison with the history of another military campaign under the leadership of a general for whom the historian entertains a similar warmth of personal feeling. The justice of comparing Tacitus with himself in this respect will not be questioned; for if the comparison reveals identity or similarity of treatment, or if, on the other hand, it reveals fundamental difference, we shall possess, so to speak, the author's own judgment as to the literary character of this portion of the *Agricola*.

That there is a certain similarity in Tacitus's portraiture of Agricola and Germanicus, each the successful leader of Roman arms in the establishment of the imperial frontier and each the victim of an emperor's jealous hate, has been observed more than once, and in general the two descriptions lend themselves very naturally to comparison. But in the technique of characterization of the two men there is a difference so marked and striking that it can only be attributed to fundamentally different conceptions of the nature and purpose of the two works. In the *Agricola*, as we have seen (and I confine myself here exclusively to the record of campaigns, chaps. 18-29), events are recorded and their significance for the personality of the hero is pointed out in such a way as to reveal that the emphasis of the narrative lies upon the characterization. It is, furthermore, noteworthy that not a single officer other than Agricola is allowed to appear upon the scene by name, although it would have seemed natural in a historical narrative to designate at least the commander of the fleet which played so important a rôle in the conquest of Caledonia, and which accomplished the circumnavigation of Britain and the exploration of the Northern Sea. In the reform of the civil administration of the island the Roman procurator must also have played a prominent part, for without his co-operation such changes in the levying of tribute as are recorded must have been quite impossible. It is not too much to affirm that the encomiastic nature of the *Agricola* is responsible for such suppression.

The campaigns of Germanicus on the German frontier are described in the *Annals* beginning at I, 33, and continuing, with the interposition of some other material, as far as II, 26. The account covers the expeditions of the years 14, 15, and 16 A. D.

It is, of course, a much more detailed narrative than the record of expeditions in Britain, and this in itself would be an adequate explanation for the fact that the deeds of the lieutenants of Germanicus come in for a conspicuous share of attention. The three officers who had charge of fitting out the fleet in the third campaign are mentioned by name (II, 6), and even the name of an eagle-bearer who protected a Roman envoy against the mutinous violence of the legionaries is recorded (I, 39). But the difference in fulness of narrative and historical importance of events, which might account for such differences of treatment as these, will not explain the fact that throughout this whole campaign, exceeding by many pages the length of the corresponding part of the *Agricola*, the events recorded are very rarely used for the purpose of direct characterization of the leading figure. Germanicus is almost constantly before us, in speech or plans or action, but the reader is left to draw his own inferences and to interpret the character dramatically from the course of the narrative. There is not a single characterization of Germanicus in the field comparable to *Agr.*, 20; nor, again, of his strategic skill in the selection and defense of camps as in 22. There is no characterization whatever of the civil administration of his province (*Agr.*, 19 and 21). In general, the narrative is dramatic in the highest sense, and scarcely once does the writer lay down the rôle of narrator to point out the bearing of events upon the character of his hero. Such characterization as is found is for the most part implicit in the narrative. Exceptions are few and of slight extent, as, for instance, in chap. 33, where upon the first introduction of Germanicus it was necessary for the writer to place the reader in possession of his attitude toward him. It is given first as an expression of the general feeling of the Roman people: *unde in Germanicum favor et spes eadem*, a statement which elicits from Tacitus a personal indorsement: *nam iuveni civile ingenium, mira comitas et diversa ab Tiberii sermone vultu, adrogantibus et obscuris*. But even this case differs from the examples of the *Agricola* under discussion, in which the characterizing significance of events is pointed out.

Apart from this passage, throughout the remainder of *Annals*, I, the character of Germanicus is unfolded only in action or in his own words. This will appear from a survey of the passages of this book which convey a suggestion of personality. They are so few that they may be adduced here. His unselfish support of Tiberius: *sed Germanicus quanto summae spei propior, tanto impensius pro Tiberio niti* (I, 34); he replies to Sergestes *elemente responso* (I, 58), though the epithet is rather strategic than personal; his *pietas* toward the memory of Varus and his army (I, 61); in the performance of the last rites on the scene of their defeat he placed the first sod upon the tumulus—*gratissimo munere in defunctos et praesentibus doloris socius* (I, 62); Germanicus relieves the soldiery out of his own purse and assuages the memory of disaster by his personal kindness (I, 71).

But the principal characterization of Germanicus is reserved for the eve of the decisive battle (II, 12). The extraordinary reserve of Tacitus in his historical works in the matter of direct personal analysis is nowhere better illustrated. The charac-

terization takes a dramatic form, not that of the course of events, but the singular and almost bizarre device of representing Germanicus as stealing forth in disguise into the streets of the camp in order to test the temper of the soldiers by their own utterances in their own haunts (II, 13): *adsistit tabernaculis fruiturque fama sui, cum hic nobilitatem ducis, decorem alius, plurimi patientiam, comitatem, etc.*²³

Of more directly encomiastic character is a brief statement of Germanicus's strategic skill in II, 20, where, after describing the plans of the enemy, Tacitus continues: *nihil ex his Caesari incognitum: consilia locos, prompta occulta noverat astusque hostium in perniciem ipsis vertebat*; and just beyond: *quod arduum sibi cetera legatis permisit*. The passage is comparable to *Agr.*, 25 *extr.* and 26 *init.*, and is almost the only considerable passage of direct praise which the whole episode contains. In II, 22, after giving the inscription placed upon the trophy raised by Germanicus, Tacitus adds: *de se nihil addidit, metu invidiae an ratus conscientiam facti satis esse*. The words furnish another illustration of the difference between encomium and history. As a historian Tacitus designates two possible motives. The encomiast would not hesitate to select the one which should yield the greater praise to his hero. The contrast is well shown by *Agricola*, 18 *extr.* (after the successes of the first campaign): *ne laureatis quidem gesta prosecutus est, sed ipsa dissimulatione famae famam auxit*. To complete the list of passages which have more or less direct characterizing significance for Germanicus, we may add the description of the energy with which the war was continued after the naval disaster to the Romans (II, 25): *eo promptior Caesar pergit*, etc., and the brief mention of the generosity which was shown to the soldiers in making good individual losses (II, 26). But in all this there is but slight trace of that type of characterization (through the implications of acts) which confronts us constantly in the *Agricola*. It is possible that some passages have been omitted; yet I have gone over the text repeatedly, and I suspect rather that I have included more than really belongs here. The difference between the portion of the *Agricola* under consideration and the treatment of Germanicus in the *Annals* is clear and marked. In the *Agricola*, although the external form of historiography is preserved, yet in its essence the account is in the manner of encomium, in which, as was pointed out above, the *πράξεις* are adduced, not as historical events *per se*, but as indications of traits of character (*ὥσπερ γνωρίσματα τῶν τῆς ψυχῆς ἀρετῶν*).

The truth of this statement will appear from a brief review of the principal characterizing incidents and the encomiastic comment elicited by them which these chapters of the *Agricola* contain: The unexpected attack upon the Ordovices immediately upon his arrival, as an index of the energy of Agricola in contrast to the delay advised by his officers and expected by the army; recognition of the importance of

²³ The significance of this episode for Tacitus's technique of characterization is pointed out by BRUNS, *Die Persönlichkeit in der antiken Geschichtsschreibung*, Berlin,

1899. Cf. also NORDEN, *Antike Kunstprosa*, Vol. I, p. 87: "Tacitus, der grösste Psychologe unter den Historikern, ist doch sehr zurückhaltend."

following up a first success (*non ignarus instandum famae*) by the attack on Mona; ingenuity and perseverance (*ratio et constantia ducis*) in finding a means of crossing in the absence of ships; contrast of the effect produced by his activity with the vanity and ostentation of most proconsuls on entering their province; modesty in success (18). Recognition of the wrongs of the province (*animorum provinciae prudens*) and determination to make his reforms strike at the root of evils; discipline of his own servants; justice in the administration of civil affairs; *σύγκρισις* with the carelessness and harshness of his predecessors (19 and 20, 1-3). Efficiency as a commander and characterization of him in the field (20). Encouragement of the arts of peace (21). Conquest of new territory; strategic skill as shown in choice of sites for fortification; persistence, in contrast to the relaxing of effort of predecessors; generous recognition of deeds of others; interpretation by Tacitus of his reputed *acerbitas*, with implied *σύγκρισις* (22). Completion of the conquest of Britain proper and determination not to stop at that point, ascribed to the *virtus exercituum et Romani nominis gloria* (23). Statesmanship shown in plans for the conquest of Ireland (24). The first to employ the aid of a fleet (with strong encomiastic *αὔξεις*); bravery and resourcefulness, in contrast to the cowardice of his military advisers (25 and 26). Zeal of the army to complete the exploration and conquest of Britain, and enthusiasm of the officers who had before counseled retreat; reflection that the merit of success is claimed by all, the disgrace of defeat is attributed to one (27). Humanity of Agricola in grief (29).

It is evident that in this record of events, with the characterizing comment which accompanies it, we have portrayed, through the medium of typical deeds, a series of qualities, and it is apparent that Tacitus aims to present to us an all-sided picture of Agricola in the rôle of a provincial governor. He is shown to us not only as a warrior, resourceful and efficient in the field, self-reliant, generous to his subordinates, and modest in success, but also as a radical reformer in provincial administration, a patron of the arts of peace, a statesman discerning the importance of further conquests for the advantage of the empire as a whole.

If it has now been made clear that the essential affinities of chaps. 18-39 of the *Agricola* are rather with encomiastic narrative than with historical, we may turn to the consideration of some portions of the section preceding, which sets forth the geography and ethnology of Britain and gives a brief survey of its conquest down to Agricola's time. The bearing of this portion upon the personality of Agricola has generally been held to be even more remote than the record of his campaigns which we have just reviewed. But let us turn at once to the text. In the opening sentence Tacitus assigns as a reason for describing *Britanniae situm populosque* the fact that the complete subjugation of Britain has put him in possession of knowledge which others lacked. With their rhetoric he will not vie: the merit of his narrative shall be fidelity to facts. The matter is presented thus with the appearance of utmost

objectivity, and the name of Agricola is suppressed throughout. Tacitus speaks as a historian who has made his investigations and now presents the results. The form is distinctly historical and not encomiastic. But the moment the reader reflects that the source of Tacitus's information is Agricola, and that he is the author of the explorations which replaced ignorance and report by knowledge, it will be seen that the very objectivity of narrative is encomium in its most persuasive form. Nor are expressions lacking to impress upon the mind of the reader the indebtedness of history to him. Throughout this chapter the encomiastic significance of each of the more important items recorded is emphasized: the complete conquest of Britain (*quia tum primum perdomita est*); the certainty that it was an island (*tunc primum Romana classis circumvecta*); the discovery of unknown islands beyond (*incognitas ad id tempus insulas quas Orcadas vocant*). The encomiastic value of such phrases may be seen from the rhetorical doctrine of appropriate topics of praise as presented, for instance, by Cicero (*De Or.*, II, 347): *sumendae res . . . novitate primae*, or by Theon (*Sp.* II, p. 110, 21): *ἐπαινεταὶ δέ εἰσιν αἱ πράξεις . . . καὶ εἰ μόνος ἔπραξέ τις ἢ πρῶτος ἢ ὅτε οὐδεὶς κτλ.* In practice it might be illustrated at great length, but one or two examples will suffice: (*Cons. ad Liv.*, 19) *ille . . . ignotumque tibi meruit, Romane, triumphum* || *protulit in terras imperiumque novas*. Cf. also the epigrams in praise of Claudius's expedition into Britain, e. g., *P. L. M.*, IV, p. 69 (30): *vieta prius nulli, nullo spectata triumpho* || *inlibata tuos gens patet in titulos*. Compare also with the whole chapter the praise bestowed upon Cæsar by Antony in the funeral oration which Dio Cassius presents in XLIV, 42, 5, where, after enumerating the varied conquests and explorations of Cæsar in Gaul, Germany, and Britain, he concludes: *ἐμβατὰ μὲν τὰ πρὶν ἄγνωστα, πλωτὰ δὲ τὰ πρόσθεν ἀδιαρεύνητα . . . ποιήσας*.

That Tacitus conceived of this matter as a source of praise to Agricola is here only suggested in the manner pointed out. The full encomiastic import of it he reserves for rhetorical elaboration in the speeches of Calgacus and Agricola (*vide supra*): first negatively, in the words of Calgacus (chap. 30), concluding with *sed nunc terminus Britanniae patet*, and then positively, in the speech of Agricola—*finem Britanniae non fama nec rumore sed castris et armis tenemus*. They are the counterpart to the simple statement of the ignorance of earlier writers in chap. 10 (*nondum comperta*). Contrast also with the direct statement of the complete discovery and subjugation of Britain in chap. 10 the rhetorical outburst of Agricola's speech—*Britannia inventa et subacta*. One may compare further with the more sober description of the remoteness of the extreme coast of Britain in chap. 10 (*hanc oram novissimi maris*) the effective rhetorical appeal to the imagination of the soldiers in 33 *extr.*: *nec inglorium fuerit in ipso terrarum ac naturae fine cecidisse*. To no inconsiderable extent the narrative of chap. 10 paves the way for the more expressly encomiastic and rhetorical treatment in the subsequent course of the work.

But, in spite of the soberness of tone of this chapter, there is noticeable a certain exaggeration in the treatment of Agricola's explorations which can scarcely be

attributed to the author's ignorance of the status of geographical knowledge. For, while Tacitus only affirms that Britain was then for the first time circumnavigated by a Roman fleet, he still leads the reader to believe that this circumnavigation established a disputed fact of geography (*insulam esse Britanniam adfirmavit*). But in reality, as Furneaux observes (p. 23), all earlier writers—Cæsar, Diodorus, Strabo, Mela, Pliny—speak of it without hesitation as a triangular island.²⁴ Similarly it seems hardly credible that Tacitus should be ignorant that earlier geographers had named and located the Orkneys, and his claim that they were discovered by Agricola (*ignotas ad id tempus insulas invenit*) is open to the suspicion of exaggeration from the manifest hyperbole of the further statement concerning their subjugation (*domuitque*).

In the rapid survey of the conquest of Britain down to Agricola's time, it has impressed many as remarkable that approximately one-third of the space should be given up to a statement of the motives which led to the uprising in the administration of Suetonius Paulinus (reported indirectly in chap. 15). This whole preliminary survey is designated by Andresen as wholly without relation to the personality of Agricola, but this chapter he finds especially irrelevant, and sees in it evidence for his view, that Tacitus in chaps. 10–39 is writing a history of Britain, and not a biography of Agricola. As for the rest of this division, it will not, I think, seem remarkable to an unbiased reader that the record of Agricola's campaigns should be prefaced by a brief account of the work accomplished by his predecessors. It may not, however, be so obvious why in this very rapid sketch so much space is given to the causes of the uprising led by Boudicca. But, first, to approach the matter negatively, it may be said that, had Tacitus here been concerned only to write a history of Britain, he surely could not have passed over the great battle, with which the insurrection was quelled, so briefly (*quam unius proelii fortuna veteri patientiae restituit*, 16), after devoting so much space to the motives which led to the revolt. The treatment of the episode in the *Annals* (XIV, 35–37) reveals what must have been expected here of a historian: the wrongs of the Britons and the provocation to revolt (indirect speech of Boudicca, chap. 35), exhortation of Suetonius to his soldiers (36), description of the battle (36, 11–37, 8). The battle was one of the great and decisive struggles of Roman arms against the resistance of Britain to Roman subjugation (*clara et antiquis victoriis par ea die laus parata*), and, historically considered, was of more significance than any of Agricola's conquests. It is obvious, therefore, that such a hypothesis as Andresen's does not adequately account for the distribution of matter as found in the *Agricola*.

The true explanation lies in the desire of the historian to put the reader in

²⁴QUINTILIAN, VII. 4, 2, cannot be used, as it is by URLICHS (*De vita et honor. Tac.*, p. 17), to show that the insularity of Britain was a matter of dispute down to Agricola's time. The words *ut si Cæsar deliberet an Britanniam impugnet, quæ sit Oceani natura*, an Britan-

nia insula (nam tum ignorabatur) refer, of course, to a declamatory theme assuming a time before Cæsar's invasion, and, as is expressly pointed out, only imply that at that time was the fact unknown.

possession of the attitude of the people of Britain toward the Roman occupation. In the record of the deeds of Agricola's several predecessors, Tacitus in his own words records the character of each administration impartially and without calculated depreciation, rising even to emphatic praise of the two immediate predecessors of Agricola (17 *init.*). But of the attitude of the islanders toward the Roman administration he says nothing in his own person. This was the dark obverse to a history of progressive conquest—the fact that Roman success had done nothing to conciliate the loyalty of a conquered people, but had used its power for extortion and the gratification of the lust of those in power. It is for this reason that the speech in the *Agricola* contains a more general statement of grievances than the corresponding speech of Boudicca in the *Annals*. The exposition of this state of affairs is assigned with dramatic feeling to the utterances of the Britons themselves, and at the same time the writer relieves himself of the odium of directing so serious an indictment against the predecessors of Agricola. That some such explanation of the spirit which had characterized the earlier administration of the province was necessary to afford a setting for the reforms of Agricola appears at the beginning of chap. 19: *Ceterum animorum provinciae prudens, simulque doctus per aliena experimenta parum profici armis si iniuriae sequerentur, causas bellorum statuit excidere*. The reforms which are then enumerated are, with approximate exactness, corrections of the abuses which are complained of in the indirect speech under consideration. The concluding words of this section set the matter in a very clear light (20 *int.*): *haec primo statim anno comprimendo egregiam famam paci circumdedit, quae vel incuria vel intolerantia priorum haud minus quam bellum timebatur*.

The foregoing argument has been directed primarily toward showing that, in spite of the historical form in which Tacitus has cast his material from chap. 10 to 39, it still remains essentially biographical, with the encomiastic connotation which that word implies. In explanation of the form I have suggested above the desire to lend greater persuasiveness to encomium by the appearance of an objective historical record and to avoid the invidiousness of direct praise. That Tacitus, at all events (whether by design or not), has attained this end is evinced perhaps most conclusively by the very fact that so many modern readers have found in the *Agricola* a historical rather than a biographical character. But for his own time I think it may be fairly questioned whether Tacitus's eloquence was interpreted otherwise than as an encomiastic utterance of filial piety, and by this I have no thought of impugning either the character of Agricola or the honesty of Tacitus, but only of interpreting the literary treatment of the subject. It is perhaps no more than an unwarranted suspicion which I would raise concerning the probable treatment of the episode of Agricola's administration of Britain in the lost books of the *Histories*. But the fact that subsequent historians do not refer to the operations of Agricola in Britain (Dio Cassius merely alludes to the desertion of the Usipian cohort and the consequent

circumnavigation of the island) would lend color to the conjecture that Tacitus himself, in his capacity of historian, claimed less for the merit of Agricola than he had urged in the rôle of encomiast of his father-in-law. One bit of evidence Tacitus himself affords, which is at least significant of the difference between encomium and history. For Tacitus, although writing not earlier than the year 97, says simply, in explanation of his reason for describing the geography of Britain: *quia tum primum perdomita est*. But in the *Histories* (I, 2) he adds the important qualification: *perdomita Britannia et statim missa*. It is significant of the difference in the character of the two works that the *Agricola* contains not a word of the transient nature of the conquests recorded. They are treated throughout as permanent results. The loss of Britain, to be sure, might have been treated as a *τόπος ψεκτικός* against Domitian, and in a historical treatment it would inevitably have found a place with the other disasters enumerated in chap. 41; but in general it could only have been to lessen the praise of Agricola to remind the reader that the fruits of his victories were, at the time of writing, already lost. Of the same character is the unhistorical exaggeration in the treatment of Agricola's explorations to which allusion has been made above. That a conscientious historian might distribute emphasis very differently in biographical and historical treatment of the same subject-matter is well shown by Polybius's allusion to his life of Philopoemen (X, 21 (24), 5 ff.). After indicating the external differences which would characterize the historical treatment of the deeds in which Philopoemen played a leading rôle, he adds (8): "For while biography, being encomiastic in nature, demands a summary presentation of deeds with rhetorical amplification of them, history, being indifferent to praise or blame, calls for a truthful and accurate account of events with the consequences which follow upon each."²⁵

Much confusion has been introduced into the discussion of the problems relating to the *Agricola* by the failure to separate the question of literary form from the question of ulterior political or apologetic purpose, which many have found in the biography. So, for instance, Schanz cites Hübner's and Andresen's theories of literary form as alternative views to Hoffmann's theory of the apologetic character of the treatise. But, while it is too much to say that there is no relation between these questions, yet it is obvious that a *laudatio funebris* might be an apologetic, political manifesto (as we know, in fact, that such works effected a distortion of history in the interest of certain families), and the same end could obviously have been attained through the medium of a historical narrative. Generally speaking, therefore, any demonstrable theory of form would not be inconsistent with any further demonstrable theory of purpose or tendency.

For the settlement of the question of a possible political motive in the portrayal of the last years of Agricola, our knowledge of the inner history of the time is unfortunately inadequate. Practically all those who have found in the treatise the

²⁵ ὥσπερ γὰρ ἐκεῖνος ὁ τόπος, ὑπάρχων ἐγκωμιαστικός, ἀπῆτει τὸν κεφαλαιώδη καὶ μετ' αὐξήσεως τῶν πράξεων ἀπολογισμὸν· οὕτως ὁ τῆς ἱστορίας, κοινὸς ὢν ἐπαίνου καὶ ψόγου, ζητεῖ τὸν ἀληθῆ καὶ τὸν μετ' ἀποδείξεως καὶ τῶν ἐκάστοις παρεπομένων συλλογισμὸν.

program of a political creed, or a vindication of the memory of Agricola (and so of the moderate party) against the charge of dishonorable servility, have based their theories in the first instance upon the famous words in chap. 42: *Domitiani vero natura praeceps in iram, et quo obscurior, eo inrevocabilior, moderatione tamen prudentiaque Agricola leniebatur, quia non contumacia neque inani iactatione libertatis famam fatumque provocabat. sciant, quibus moris est illicita mirari, posse etiam sub malis principibus magnos viros esse, obsequiumque ac modestiam, si industria ac vigor adsint, eo laudis escendere, quo plerique per abrupta, sed in nullum rei publicae usum, ambitiosa morte inclaruerunt.*

Students of Tacitus have debated hotly and with easy honors whether the principle here laid down is consistent with the general attitude of our author elsewhere toward the question at issue—a question which, from the time of Tiberius at least, had come to be one of the most vital problems of practical ethics for every great and influential public character. Evidence from Tacitus's own utterances can be adduced on both sides. We can show that the very men—Thrasea, Rusticus, Helvidius—whose contumacy is here so vehemently assailed, are elsewhere touched with a kindlier hand, and to the description of their deaths there is lent the suggestion of martyrdom. Even in the *Agricola*, but a few pages farther on, Tacitus recalls with horror the share which the senate was compelled to have in shedding the innocent blood of Helvidius, Rusticus, Senecio (45). And similarly at the opening of the work these same men are instanced as martyrs whose deaths put to blush the acquiescence of himself and his compeers (*dedimus profecto grande patientiae documentum*). Surely in these passages there is no thought of sparing himself for his share in the degradation of those last years of Domitian's tyranny. Nor does Tacitus fail to record elsewhere with manifest admiration utterances which reveal a bold but fruitless independence of spirit. On the other hand, it is true that he praises the moderation of men who have known how to steer a middle course *inter abruptam contumaciam et deforme obsequium* (*Ann.*, IV, 20). But the essential difference between this passage and other analogous expressions of political prudence, as, for instance, the one just cited, lies in the form and tone. Elsewhere, with a certain sadness and resignation, he commends acquiescence because of the fruitlessness of opposition. Here he passes quickly from the fact of Agricola's submission to praise of his conduct, as an example of the glory that it was possible for a good man of vigor and efficiency to win under a bad emperor. For myself I cannot escape the feeling that the arrogant ἐπίκρισις (*sciant quibus*, etc.) rings false, and betrays that the writer is making the worse appear the better cause for the ends which filial devotion demanded. For, in the first place, it is not easy to see what there could have been in Agricola's dignified acceptance, when it should be offered him, of a high proconsular post, which Tacitus could honestly designate as a "seeking for notoriety and a challenging of his own fate by contumacy and a vainglorious affectation of independence." Would not the more honorable and patriotic course have been to accept the reward which his merit had won and await the consequences? Agricola, of his

own motion, we are led to believe, would have followed this course, but was finally persuaded and terrified by his friends (*suadentes simul terrentesque pertraxere ad Domitianum*) into asking the ignoble favor of release from service. The humiliation of the request to Agricola is the aspect of the narrative which most impresses the modern reader; we are less concerned that Domitian did not blush at the odiousness of the benefit he conferred. Is this, then, that middle course between *contumacia* and *deforme obsequium* which Tacitus praised in Lepidus? Surely Tacitus has not spared his pen to make us realize how hideous the acquiescence of Agricola was. After such a scene we might concede a final judgment like that which is accorded to L. Piso (*Ann.*, VI, 10): *nullius servilis sententiae sponte auctor et quotiens necessitas ingrueret sapienter moderans*. But one is led to the suspicion of special pleading, which always played a large rôle in encomium, when we are asked to condemn the simple course of honor which Agricola might have pursued as headstrong and boastful, and are expected to admire as the highest political wisdom a maxim generalized from a scene of humiliating submission.

But I claim only to give my feeling, based upon the repeated perusal of this passage and upon a comparison with utterances of related character elsewhere in Tacitus. I do not expect to carry conviction, on a subject which does not admit of positive demonstration, to those who, having weighed the matter, find nothing unnatural or inconsistent in the treatment. But I would point out that, had Tacitus desired to give a favorable interpretation to an act of doubtful credit to his hero, he would have conformed entirely to the theories of encomiastic style in handling the matter as he has done here. Even Plutarch,²⁶ who writes as a biographer rather than as a professed encomiast, urges that defects of character which the exigencies of public life have imposed upon a man otherwise admirable are to be treated with an indulgent hand. The theory of encomium went further and prescribed rules for the encomiastic presentation of such defects. Aristotle, *Rhet.*, 1367a, 32: *ληπτέον δὲ καὶ τὰ σύνεγγυς τοῖς ὑπάρχουσιν ὡς ταῦτ' ὄντα, καὶ πρὸς ἔπαινον καὶ πρὸς ψόγον, οἷον τὸν εὐλαβῆ ψυχρὸν καὶ ἐπίβουλον καὶ τὸν ἡλίθιον χρηστὸν κτλ.* (as here the acquiescence of Agricola is called *moderatio* and *prudentia*, the other course which lay open to him *contumacia* and *inanis iactatio libertatis*) . . . καὶ ἕκαστον δ' ἐκ τῶν παρακολουθούντων αἰεὶ κατὰ τὸ βέλτιστον. The same doctrine as formulated by the late rhetorician Nicolaus Sophista (*Sp.* III, p. 481, 20) applies to the case in hand more accurately: *καὶ εἶπον τι ἐλάττωμα ἔχει, καὶ τοῦτο πειρασόμεθα περιστέλλειν εὐφημοτέροις λόγοις, τὴν δειλίαν εὐλάβειαν καὶ προμήθειαν (cf. moderatione prudentiaque) καλοῦντες, τὸ δὲ θράσος ἀνδρείαν καὶ εὐψυχίαν, καὶ ὅλως αἰεὶ πάντα ἐπὶ τὸ κάλλιον ἐργαζόμενοι.* That even in a corrupt and debased state it is still possible for a man to attain distinction and lead an honorable life (*posse etiam sub malis principibus magnos viros esse*) had been affirmed by Seneca (*De Tranq.*, 5, 3): *ut scias et in adflicta republica esse occasionem sapienti*

²⁶ CIMON, 2, 4: τὰς δ' ἐκ πάθους τινὸς ἢ ἐκ πολιτικῆς ἀνάγκης ἐπιτρεχούσας ταῖς πράξεσιν ἀμαρτίας καὶ κήρας ἐλλείματα μᾶλλον

ἀρετῆς τινος ἢ κακίας πονηρεύματα νομίζοντας οὐ δεῖ πάννυ προθύμως ἐναποσημαίνειν κτλ.

viro ad se proferendum.²⁷ The principle must have been a more or less conventional one in encomiastic-apologetic literature, as Theon shows (Sp. II, p. 111, 25): *λεκτέον ὅτι . . . καὶ ἐν πολιτείᾳ φαύλη τεθραμμένος οὐ διεστράφη, ἀλλὰ τῶν καθ' αὐτὸν ἄριστος ἔγενετο, ὥσπερ Πλάτων ἐν ὀλιγαρχίᾳ*.

The rhetorical treatment of circumstances in which an honorable course of action is crossed by some exigency which leads to a less honorable course forms the subject of a considerable doctrine in the theory of encomium. It is presented, so far as I am aware, most fully by Cicero (*De Inv.*, II, 166 ff.). The subject is introduced in 166 with these words: *ac de eo quidem genere honestatis quod ex omni parte propter se petitur satis dictum est; nunc de eo in quo utilitas quoque adiungitur, quod tamen honestum vocamus, dicendum videtur*. At 170 he passes to a new phase of the subject: *quoniam ergo de honestate et de utilitate diximus, nunc restat ut de eis rebus, quas his attributas esse dicebamus, necessitudine et adfectione perscribamus*. Concerning *necessitudo* he continues in 173: *ac summa quidem necessitudo videtur esse honestatis; huic proxima incolumitatis; . . . hasce autem inter se saepe necesse est comparari* (as in our passage of the *Agricola* *incolumitas* is accounted the wiser consideration because of the uselessness of opposition). Therefore, though *honestas* is the higher motive, we must consider which of the two is to be consulted (174): *nam qua in re fieri poterit ut, cum incolumitati consuluerimus, quod sit in praesentia de honestate delibatum, virtute aliquando et industria recuperetur* [cf. *si industria ac vigor adsint* in our passage of the *Agricola*] *incolumitatis ratio videbitur habenda*. In such a case *vere poterimus dicere nos honestatis rationem habere*, for only in personal safety will it be possible to consult the demands of honor for the future. Therefore *vel concedere alteri vel ad conditionem alterius descendere vel in praesentia quiescere atque aliud tempus exspectare oportebit*, provided only the cause which impels us to look to our temporary advantage (*ad utilitatem*) is found adequate *quare de magnificentia aut de honestate quiddam derogetur*. We must inquire, therefore, carefully into the conditions which justify such a course.²⁸

By way of summary of what has been said of the encomiastic character of the *Agricola* and of the bearing of this fact upon the style and upon the apologetic tendency of the work, may be noticed here Aristides's formulation of four rules of encomiastic treatment (Sp. II, p. 505, 10): *λαμβάνονται δὲ οἱ ἔπαινοι κατὰ τρόπους τέσσερας, αὐξήσει παραλείψει παραβολῇ εὐφημία*. Of each of these the *Agricola* has furnished examples. Of rhetorical amplification we have seen examples in detail in the invasion of Mona, the employment of a fleet, and especially in the calculated cumulative effect with which the complete discovery and conquest of Britain is presented. Of suppres-

²⁷ It is a significant contrast to Tacitus's application of the utterance that Seneca's generalization follows the example of the trial and death of Socrates.

²⁸ The same subject is touched upon briefly by QUINTILIAN, III, 8, 22. The theory is apparently alluded to by

Tacitus in the passage of the *Annals* cited above concerning L. Piso (VI, 10): *quotiens necessitas ingrueret sapienter moderans*, and perhaps also in *Agr.*, 33 extr.: *incolumitas ac decus eodem loco sita sunt*.

sion (παράλειψις) there are some minor examples, to which Hoffmann especially has called attention, and I have noted above the fact that the transient character of Agricola's conquests is not allowed to appear. Of the use of comparison (παραβολή or σύγκρισις) many examples have been adduced, and we have seen that it is one of the most characteristic features of the style of the treatise. The most formal and elaborate example, in which Agricola is contrasted with Domitian and his generals (chap. 41), is commented upon in the Appendix (p. 31). Of favorable interpretation (εὐφημία) of acts or events which were at best colorless, or perhaps even censurable, we have noted the explanation of the *acerbitas* of Agricola, and I have suggested that the ἐπίκρισις in 42 (*sciunt quibus*, etc.) with its context seems to be a rhetorical defense of a course of conduct of doubtful credit. There are some other examples which might be instanced in this category, as the comment in chap. 6 on the inactivity of Agricola's tribuneship: *gnarus sub Nerone temporum quibus inertia pro sapientia fuit*.

I am aware that investigations of the sort here presented are likely to be looked upon as hypersceptical indictments of the historical accuracy of our sources. But with questions of historical fact we are here only incidentally concerned; the object of my study has been to define, if possible, the difference in literary treatment between encomiastic biography and history. Unfortunately the means of direct comparison which the treatment of the same events in the *Histories* might have afforded are not available. In Xenophon the difference in the treatment of Agesilaus in the encomium of that name and in the *Hellenica* led scholars for a long time to dispute the authenticity of the former work. In Polybius, unfortunately, we do not possess the full historical treatment of Philopoemen, and all trace of the special biography of him has disappeared. But that there was a considerable difference in the handling of the material in the two works we must believe on the authority of Polybius himself, as was indicated above. A pointed illustration of the differences between the two forms of literary treatment is afforded by the inconsistencies which are revealed in Tacitus's account of Corbulo in the latter part of the *Annals*. The immediate source of his information was, I believe, an encomiastic biography analogous to the *Agricola*. For large parts of his narrative he follows this closely, and thus introduces into history the tone and spirit of encomium. At other times he discredits its statements and endeavors to maintain the objectivity of the historian. The result is curiously inharmonious. But the detailed consideration of this question must be postponed to another time. It was on the basis of a long tradition of biographical literature, composed from the point of view of encomium, that Tacitus wrote the life of his father-in-law. That in many instances, as we have seen, details of treatment correspond to the theoretical precepts of the rhetoricians, is due rather to the biographical and encomiastic monuments from which such principles were derived, than to a conscious observance of rhetorical theory itself.

APPENDIX

Some miscellaneous observations are here appended which it has not been found convenient to include in the continuous argument of the preceding:

5, 2: *prima castrorum rudimenta in Britannia Suetonio Paulino . . . adprobavit, electus quem contubernio aestimaret.* Cf. also 6, 18: *electus a Galba ad dona templorum recognoscenda*, etc. 9, 22: *haud semper errat fama, aliquando et elegit.* The encomiastic significance of these passages is set in somewhat clearer light by the precept of the rhetorician Theon (περὶ ἐγκωμίου), Sp. II, p. 110, 25: δὲ δὲ λαμβάνειν καὶ τὰς κρίσεις τῶν ἐνδόξων, καθάπερ οἱ ἐπαινοῦντες Ἑλένην ὅτι Θησεὺς προέκρινε. Cf. also note on *iudicium* (43, 17) below.

9, 10: *ubi officio satis factum, nullam ultra potestatis personam, tristitiam et adrogantiam et avaritiam exuerat.* So the MSS. Rhenanus's correction, which is generally adopted—*nulla ultra potestatis persona. Tristitiam*, etc.—ascribes directly to Agricola qualities which a panegyrist could scarcely name even to deny. The correction of Urlichs—*nihil ultra: potestatis personam*, etc.—seems to me simpler, but I would retain the words *tristitiam, adrogantiam, avaritiam*, which Urlichs brackets. Tacitus, in characterizing the *potestatis personam*, has allowed himself to ascribe to it, in the detached manner of a satirical historian, the conventional attributes of Roman provincial governors, unmindful that the mere mention of them in this connection conveys a suggestion scarcely to the praise of Agricola. One may compare the satirical remark at the end of chap. 21, which seems to suggest a sinister design in Agricola's measures for the civilization of his province quite at variance with the writer's purpose as an encomiast. *Vide supra*, p. 11. A parallel example is afforded by Isoc., *Euag.*, 78, which, though addressing a compliment to Nicocles, conveys a reflection upon the class to which he belongs: πρῶτος καὶ μόνος τῶν ἐν τυραννίδι καὶ πλούτῳ καὶ τρυφαίᾳ ὄντων φιλοσοφεῖν καὶ πονεῖν ἐπιχειρήσας.

10, 6: *Britannia . . . spatio ac caelo in orientem Germaniae, in occidentem Hispaniae obtenditur.* So far as I am aware, *spatio ac caelo* are universally taken as ablatives (of respect) with *Britannia*, and as such have been felt to be and certainly are otiose. They are, however, I believe, datives in hendiadys (= *spatio caeli*) with *obtenditur*. *Germaniae* and *Hispaniae* are genitives depending upon them. The position of Britain in relation to Germany and to Spain is designated by *in orientem* and *in occidentem* respectively. "Britain lies in the same latitude (*spatio ac caelo . . . obtenditur*) as that of Germany on the east and of Spain on the west." In contrast to this more general indication of geographical position, with relation to regions on the east and west, follows an exact designation of the southern boundary: *Gallis in meridiem etiam inspicitur*. The emphasis upon the proximity of Gaul may have been evoked by the inexact statement of Pliny, IV, 16, 30: *ex adverso huius situs* (the Low Countries) *Britannia insula inter septentrionalem et occidentem iacet, Germaniae, Galliae, Hispaniae . . . magno intervallo adversa.*

10, 18: *sed mare pigrum et grave remigantibus perhibent*, etc. The phenomenon does not admit of a satisfactory explanation, if we think of Tacitus as describing something actually observed by the expedition of exploration sent out by Agricola. There surely could have been no difficulty in recognizing fields of floating sea-weed or ice or even adverse currents. The encountering of a belt of calm in the vicinity of the Shetland Islands (to which Furneaux refers) may have seemed to lend confirmation to a widely diffused conception of the unknown outer ocean as a windless sea of almost immovable character. Walch cites a number of passages which allude to this in widely different periods of antiquity. In the discussions of this question I have not observed that the parallels afforded by Seneca Rhet., *Suas.* 1, have been cited: *Deliberat Alexander an Oceanum naviget.* His friends dissuade him from essaying so perilous

a task: *stat immotum mare, quasi deficientis in suo fine naturae pigra moles. . . . ipsum vero grave et defixum mare.* 2 extr.: *immobile profundum.* 10: *hic difficultatem navigationis, ignoti maris naturam non patientem navigationis.* 15 (*Pedo . . . in navigante Germanico dicit*): *ad rerum metas extremaque litora mundi* || *nunc illum, pigris immania monstra sub undis* || *qui ferat, Oceanum*, etc. Again, a little farther on: *atque alium flabris intactum quaerimus orbem?* But Tacitus, in *Ann.*, II, 24, says: *quanto violentior cetero mari Oceanus*, etc.

18, 23: *qui classem, qui naves, qui mare expectabant.* In explanation and defense of *mare*, Miss Katharine Allen, of the University of Wisconsin, has called my attention to *Hist.*, II, 12 init.: *possessa per mare et naves maiore Italiae parte.* An example, somewhat analogous to this, of a loose use of *mare* is afforded by Tibullus, I, 3, 50: *nunc mare, nunc leti mille repente viae*, where it stands "praegnantis sensu . . . pro nunc maris et navigationis pericula." In our passage *mare* gathers up in forcible climax the content of the preceding expressions *classem naves*. It is in no sense a descending series.

41, 18: *sic Agricola simul suis virtutibus, simul vitiis aliorum in ipsam gloriam praeceps agebatur.* This well-known passage seems to have been very generally misinterpreted. Commentators have read into it more than it really contains, and have found it an extreme example of Tacitean compression (cf. Ernesti's characterization of it as "acuminis captatio," Walch, Wex, Furneaux, and the conjectures of Madvig and Baehrens). But the passage contains no suggestion that "Agricola's glory was his doom." It is merely the conclusion of a σύγκρισις, which sets forth, by contrast to the weakness and inefficiency of Domitian and his generals, the swift growth of Agricola's fame. The comparison begins with 41, 5: *et ea insecuta tempora quae sileri Agricola non sinerent.* There follow then the disasters (the negative side of the σύγκρισις—the *vitiis aliorum*) which provoked popular clamor for Agricola, *comparantibus cunctis vigorem et constantiam et expertum bellis animum cum inertia et formidine ceterorum.* The comparison concludes with the words in question: "Agricola, not only by his own virtues, but by contrast with the weakness and inefficiency of others, was hurried to the very pinnacle of fame." The correctness of this interpretation may be tested by comparison with the similar conclusion of a σύγκρισις of Pompey with other generals, in Cicero, *De imp. Pomp.*, 67: *quasi Cn. Pompeium non cum suis virtutibus tum etiam alienis vitiis magnam esse videamus.*

43, 16: *satis constat lecto testamento Agricolae, quo coheredem optimae uxori et piissimae filiae Domitianum scripsit, laetatum eum velut honore iudicioque.* The quasi-technical character of this last phrase seems to have been overlooked. Furneaux (with Andresen) thinks that the words *honore iudicioque* distinguish the act and the thought, and renders "the mark of respect and the esteem implied in it;" and so essentially Gudeman. But *iudicium* is a *terminus technicus* in the legal language of wills and inheritances for the judgment which animates a bequest, and so for the bequest itself. This transition of meaning is well shown by Seneca, *De Benef.*, IV, 11, 4: *quid . . . cum testamentum ordinamus non beneficia nihil nobis profutura dividimus? . . . atqui numquam magis iudicia nostra magis torquemus quam ubi remotis utilitatibus solum ante oculos honestum stetit.* For *suprema iudicia*, or *iudicia* alone, in the sense of *testamentum* see the passages in Forcellini, s. v., III, 13, of which Suet., *Aug.*, 66, affords a good illustration: *quamvis minime appeteret hereditates, ut qui numquam ex ignoti testamento capere quicquam sustinerit, amicorum tamen suprema iudicia morosissime pensitavit, neque dolore dissimulato si parcius aut citra honorem verborum*, etc. (These last words cast some light upon *honore* in our passage. The *honorem iudicii* alone, *citra honorem verborum*, he did not desire.) Finally a parallel which sets the meaning of our passage in the clearest light, and shows that it is to be interpreted as hendiadys for *honore*

iudicii, is afforded by the *Laudatio Murdiae* (C. I. L., VI, 10230), vs. 6: *viro certam pecuniam legavit ut ius dotis honore iudicii augetur*. (Cf. Vollmer *ad loc.*, *Jahrb.*, Suppl. Vol. XVIII, p. 487.) Cf. also Du Cange, *s. v. iudicium*. [I note that Ruperti, *ad loc.*, makes allusion to the use of the word here noted, but without closer application to the interpretation of the passage.]

44 *init.*: A transposition of sentences from the order preserved in the MSS. is a violent remedy and one justly regarded with extreme scepticism. But since we have ample evidence that errors in the sequence of ancient texts do occur, it is legitimate for the critic to point out apparent errors of this sort and to make such suggestions of restoration as are possible. This chapter begins with a brief statement of some external facts concerning Agricola: (1) his age, (2) his appearance. Then follows a considerable reflection that Agricola, though cut off in the prime of life, had attained all that long life could have granted: *et ipse quidem, quamquam medio in spatio integrae aetatis ereptus, quantum ad gloriam longissimum aevum peregit*. The position of these words is surprising, for such a reflection would more naturally have followed the statement of his age; nor can I think that *et ipse* forms an appropriate transition from the preceding. There follows an exegetical sentence: *quippe et vera bona, quae in virtutibus sita sunt, impleverat, et consulari ac triumphalibus ornamentis praedito quid aliud adstruere fortuna poterat?* The real goods of virtue and fame are here obviously contrasted with external goods of fortune, although as yet the latter have not been named. These then follow, as the third item of external character, in a manner which, as Furneaux remarks, appears irrelevant: (3) *opibus nimis non gaudebat, speciosae non contigerant*. As a matter of arrangement it would have seemed more natural to have placed the third statement of external facts immediately after the second, before proceeding to the reflections which follow (2), especially since these reflections are rather in sequence with (1) than with (2). But further, and more decisively, we should look for (3) to precede *quippe et vera bona*, so that these words may look back in proper antithesis to *opibus*.

An arrangement of the passage which would seem to meet all the difficulties which I have named, and which others (especially Furneaux and Gudeman) have raised, would be as follows: (1) *natus erat Agricola*, etc. . . . (2) *quod si habitum quoque eius posterius noscere velint*, etc., . . . *libenter*. (3) *opibus nimis non gaudebat, speciosae non contigerant*. [From this statement of his small material wealth Tacitus passes to the suggestion of his real good fortune.] *Filia atque uxore superstitibus potest videri etiam beatus incolumi dignitate, florente fama, salvis adfinitatibus et amicitiiis, futura effugisse*. [In contrast to this statement of his good fortune in the integrity of his fame and the safety of his family and friends, Tacitus turns to the fact of Agricola's own death and shows that it was not untimely.] *Et ipse quidem, quamquam medio in spatio integrae aetatis ereptus, quantum ad gloriam, longissimum aevum peregit. quippe et vera bona* [in contrast to the *opibus* above], *quae in virtutibus sita sunt, impleverat, et consulari ac triumphalibus ornamentis praedito quid aliud adstruere fortuna poterat? nam sicut ei <non licuit> durare in hanc beatissimi saeculi lucem ac principem Traianum videre . . . ita festinatae mortis grande solacium tulit evasisse postremum illud tempus*, etc. [This sentence, introduced appropriately by *nam*, anticipates the suggestion that fortune might have granted him to see the reign of Trajan, and answers it by showing that it could only have been at the cost of witnessing the last days of Domitian. The balanced clauses *nam sicut . . . ita* would perhaps best be rendered by "for though . . . still."] I have explained this, though it is obvious enough, to meet an objection which will naturally be raised to the transposition proposed. It will be said that this last sentence is the natural complement of *futura effugisse*, and it cannot be denied that the sequence of these two parts as they stand is perfectly satisfactory. I would only urge that the sequence with *quid aliud adstruere fortuna poterat* is equally natural, as I have endeavored to point out.

44, 14: *nam sicut ei <non licuit> durare in hanc beatissimi saeculi lucem ac principem Traianum videre, quod augurio votisque apud nostras auris ominabatur*, etc. Lipsius comments: "mirum si tot annos praesagiit. Nec de Traiano ulla spes aut suspicio, nisi si deus mentem illi movit, aut nostro scriptori blanditia; quod non solet." Cf. also Hoffmann, *loc. cit.* (*supra*, p. 5), p. 273. Similar auguries concerning Trajan are reported by Pliny, *Pan.*, 5 and 94, and by Dio Cassius, 67, 12, 1. They are all undoubtedly *ex eventu*, including our passage of the *Agricola*. It was a conventional feature of encomiastic literature²⁹ to assign to an early period in the life of the subject of encomium prophecies or signs of future greatness, even if they must be invented. In this case the augury is at once a source of praise to Agricola and of flattery to the emperor. The attitude of the theorists on this point is given by Menander. In speaking of portents and signs foretelling at the time of birth the future greatness of the subject of encomium, he says (*Sp.* III, p. 371, 10): *κἂν μὲν ἢ τι τοιοῦτον περὶ τὸν βασιλέα, ἐξέργασαι· ἂν δὲ οἷόν τε ἢ πλάσαι καὶ ποιεῖν τοῦτο πιθανῶς, μὴ κατόκει.* And they did not hesitate, as Pliny abundantly shows. Without the cheerful injunction to persuasive invention of the necessary auguries, Quintilian presents the same theory in III, 7, 11: *illa quoque interim ex eo quod ante ipsum fuit tempore trahuntur, quae responsis vel auguriis futuram claritatem promiserint.*

45 *init.*: *non vidit Agricolam obsessam curiam*, etc. This is commonly designated by the editors as an imitation of Cicero, *De Oratore*, III, 2, 8 (referring to the death of Crassus), and perhaps no closer parallel can be cited. However, Morowski (*De Rhetoribus Lat.*, Cracovia, 1892, p. 15) has pointed out that the rhetorical figure here used is a conventional one in the declamatory literature of the first century A. D. in describing the deaths of great men. For the whole conclusion of the *Agricola*, from 44 to the end, one should compare Seneca *Rhet.*, *Suas.*, 6, 5 and 6.

The observation suggests a concluding word: We shall not understand the style of Tacitus, nor shall we be in a position properly to judge of the content of his words, until we come to see and to feel the affinity of his nature for much which, in our modern aversion to literary artifice, we designate contemptuously as rhetorical. There is a great gulf between Tacitus and the declaimers, but it is not a total difference of kind, as, for example, the difference between Seneca and Epictetus or Fronto and Marcus Aurelius. Up to a certain point, in the technique of language and rhetorical effect, Tacitus is one of them. But beyond that, it is character and range of vision, rather than fundamentally divergent ideals, which differentiate him from them.

²⁹ Cf. NORDEN ("Ein Panegyricus auf Augustus") on VIRG., *Aen.*, VI, 799, *Rh. Mus.*, Vol. LIV, p. 468.

RETURN TO the circulation desk of any
University of California Library
or to the

NORTHERN REGIONAL LIBRARY FACILITY
Bldg. 400, Richmond Field Station
University of California
Richmond, CA 94804-4698

ALL BOOKS MAY BE RECALLED AFTER 7 DAYS
2-month loans may be renewed by calling
(510) 642-6753
1-year loans may be recharged by bringing books
to NRLF
Renewals and recharges may be made 4 days
prior to due date

DUE AS STAMPED BELOW

JAN 04 1996

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA LIBRARY

